



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

## In re Application of:

Kenneth W. Marr

Serial No.: 10/807,703

Filed: March 23, 2004

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DETERMINING BURN-IN RELIABILITY

FROM WAFER LEVEL BURN-IN

Confirmation No.: 5628

Examiner: A. Stevenson

Group Art Unit: 2812

Attorney Docket No.: 2269-5153.1US

(01-0460.01/US)

**Notice of Allowance Mailed:** 

September 17, 2004

Express Mail Mailing Label No.:

EL 994828610 US

Date of Deposit with USPS:

December 6, 2004

Person making Deposit:

**Steve Wong** 

#### TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Mail Stop Issue Fee Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant submits herewith Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal for the above-captioned application and a check in the amount of \$1,685.00 in payment therefor plus five (5) copies of the patent when issued.

Also, enclosed is an Amendment Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.312(a) and Request to Make Previously Cited References of Record (11 pages, plus attached copy of 3/23/04 IDS, Form

Serial No.: 10/807,703

PTO/SB/08, and USPTO date-stamped postcard evidencing receipt of the same by the Office); Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (3 pages); and Fee Addressee for Receipt of PTO Notices Relating to Maintenance Fees (2 pages).

Applicant understands that no additional fees are required. However, if the Office determines that any comparison fees or other additional fees are required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fees to TraskBritt Deposit Account No. 20-1469. A copy of this Transmittal Letter is enclosed for deposit account charging purposes.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff M. Michelsen

Registration No. 50,978

Attorney for Applicant(s)

TRASKBRITT

P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 6, 2004

JMM/ps:rh

Enclosures: Part B - Issue Fee Transmittal

Check No. 21176 in the amount of \$1,685.00

Copy of Transmittal Letter

Amendment Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.312(a) and Request to Make Previously

Cited References of Record (11 pages, plus attached copy of 3/23/04 IDS, Form PTO/SB/08, and USPTO date-stamped postcard evidencing receipt

of the same by the Office)

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance (3 pages)

Fee Addressee for Receipt of PTO Notices Relating to Maintenance Fees (2 pages)

Document in ProLaw





#### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Kenneth W. Marr

Serial No.: 10/807,703

Filed: March 23, 2004

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR **DETERMINING BURN-IN RELIABILITY** 

FROM WAFER LEVEL BURN-IN

Confirmation No.: 5628

Examiner: A. Stevenson

**Group Art Unit: 2812** 

Attorney Docket No.: 2269-5153.1US

(01-0460.01/US)

**Notice of Allowance Mailed:** 

September 17, 2004

Express Mail Mailing Label No.:

EL 994828610 US

Date of Deposit with USPS:

December 6, 2004

Person making Deposit:

Steve Wong

### **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Mail Stop ISSUE FEE **Commissioner for Patents** P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This communication is filed in response to the Notice of Allowance mailed September 17, 2004. The purpose of this communication is to set forth Applicants' comments, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e), on the Examiner's Statement of Allowable Subject Matter accompanying the Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner indicates:

- - -

While the prior art teaches the generating of a wafer level burn-in testing involving BIST and storing the current number of failures, but fails to teach the repeating the cycle for at least one additional cycle of burn-in testing and reading each time stamp and the current number of failures associated with the time stamp for each at least one additional cycle.

Applicants concur with the reasons as stated by the Examiner insofar as they comprise a summary, and are exemplary and not limiting. However, the scope of the claims is based on the actual language of the claims and equivalents thereof, and not on a paraphrase or summary of the claim language.

The Independent claims as allowed recite features and methodology in addition to, and in different language than, those described in the Statements of Allowable Subject Matter. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite elements in addition to those of the independent claims, which are also not reflected in the Statements of Allowable Subject Matter. Such additional features and elements, in combination with those of the independent claims from which each claim depends, provide additional reasons for patentability. Accordingly, the scope of the claims must be determined from the literal language of each as a whole, as well as all equivalents thereof.

Therefore, to the extent that the Examiner's reasons for allowance as stated are not relevant to, or wholly encompassing of, a particular claim, independent or dependent, Applicants assume that (pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.104(e)) the Examiner has determined that the record of the prosecution as a whole of the application makes clear the reasons for allowing those claims. Further, it appears, pursuant to M.P.E.P. 1302.14, that the Examiner's Statements of Allowable Subject Matter are not intended to encompass all of the reasons for allowance.

# Serial No. 10/807,703

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff M. Michelsen

Registration No. 50,978

Attorney for Applicant(s)

TRASKBRITT

P.O. Box 2550

Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550

Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: December 6, 2004

JMM/ps:rh
Document in ProLaw